

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/507,039

Applicant(s)

SCHUDEL ET AL.

Examiner

MARK EASHOO

Art Unit

1796

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MARK EASHOO.

(3) _____.

(2) Andrew Parfomak.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 August 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: those pending, especially 14 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's attorney noted that the prior Office action did not address claims 15 or 16 of the preamendment. Exr. noted a Supplemental Office action will be forthcoming.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Mark Eashoo, Ph.D./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796